

THIRD ROUND.

Augustana, negative, won from Huron, affirmative.

Augustana, affirmative, won from Yankton, negative.

This left two Augustana teams undefeated.

One of the most hotly contested events was the extemporaneous speaking contest. The subjects were selected from the leading articles in the January, February and March issues of three prominent magazines. Each contestant drew three topics and had fifteen minutes to select the one he was to use finally. The subjects were drawn one hour before the contest. The program follows:

First, "Leaders in American Politics," Katherine McCune, Huron.

Second, "American Relations with Japan," Gruhn, Northern Teachers.

Third, "The Problem of the Bootlegger," Earls,

Also speaking:

"Edison—The Industrial Genius," Lawrence, Augustana.

"Opium Problem in the United States," Shaw.

"Recent Religious Controversies," Farn.

"The Problem of the Child Labor Amendment."

"Our Service and National Defense," Rushman.

It is significant to note that the one girl in this contest carried off the honors.

Six orators appeared in the oratorical contest. The results follow:

First, "The Threatening Tide," Milton Rogers, Sioux Falls.

Second, "A Challenge to Democracy," Harrison Durand, Yankton.

Third, "On the Constitution," Harold Smith, State College.

Also speaking:

"The Man Without a Price," Clarence Westphal, Western Union.

"The Parting of the Ways," Paul Vincent, Huron.

"An Aroused Citizenry," Otto Gruhn, Northern Teachers.

Miss Green from Buena Vista also gave the oration on which she won first in the Iowa Women's contest. She was barred from the contest however.

National President Westfall gave a program concerning the coming national convention. He showed slides of Estes Park, Colorado, where the convention will be held, and a reel of motion pictures showing winter sports.

Part of one afternoon was devoted to a round table discussion. "When is an oration," as presented by Professor Gilkinson of Yankton proved to be a very helpful definition of that form of speech. Professor McCarty spoke on "Humor in debate." Professor Huffman of Sioux Falls, the president of the province, gave an interesting discussion of "The Art of Refutation," Professor Garrett of Huron, a former student of Professor Shaw of Knox, gave a most interesting talk on "Strategy in Debate," as presented by Professor Shaw in his recent book on debating. President Westfall spoke on judging debates.

The final event of the convention was a 24 hour debate between Wesleyan and State on the uniform marriage and divorce question. Contrary to what might be expected, the four who spoke presented a well organized debate with lots of good material in it. Taking his cue from some suggestions made at one of the discussions earlier in the convention, President Westfall, the single critic judge, called the debate a tie. It was a very even contest and the tie decision, while unusual, was undoubtedly the fairest.

All the delegates left full of enthusiasm and pledging each other, as many of them as will be in college next year, to meet again at the Sixth National Convention in Colorado.

CALIFORNIA PROVINCIAL CONVENTION

The California Province of Pi Kappa Delta held its 1925 Convention at Bridges Hall, California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, California, on April 11. There were 45 delegates. California Alpha of Redlands was represented by 8 members; California Beta, Occidental, by 5; California Gamma, California Institute of Technology, by 14; California Delta, College of the Pacific, by 1; California Epsilon, University of California, Southern Branch, by 13; Kansas Gamma, Kansas State Agricultural College by 3 members, guests at the Province; and Professor Scott, formerly of Nebraska Alpha, Nebraska Wesleyan, was present.

After roll-call the first round of debates was held. The question used was: Resolved, that except in case of invasion or rebellion, war should be declared by a vote of the people. The question was selected Wednesday and the debates held Saturday. The teams took the platform, tossed for sides and began to debate in five minutes. Occidental forfeited to U. of C. S. B. Redlands, affirmative, composed of Margaret White and Dale Wood, lost 1 to 0 to Edward Gilmore and Robert Ross of Cal. Tech. Occidental lost on the affirmative (Frances Ryan and Ruby MacDonald) to the Cal. Tech. negative (Robert Fulwider and Joe Walker). Redlands affirmative (Helen Irwin and Lawrence Dunn) lost to U. of C. S. B., negative (Virginia Shaw and Charles Schottland). Since U. of C. S. B. and Cal. Tech. each had two teams in the semi-finals, it was agreed to eliminate the semi-finals and hold just one more debate. The first round of debates were judged by Professor Summers of Kansas Agricultural College, Messrs. Walt and Hedberg of the Kansas Aggie debating team, and Professor Pergelis of Cal. Tech. Lunch was held at noon at the Cal. Tech. Cafeteria.

In the afternoon the oratorical contest was held with the following contestants:

Kansas State—Robert Hedberg, winner of first place
Occidental — Euphratia Pashgin, winner of second place
U. of Cal., S. B. — Arthur White, winner of third place
College of the Pacific — Edgar Wilson
Redlands — Elsie Hanson
Cal. Tech. — Joe Walker

The Coach Judge system was used; Mrs. Peters, Occidental; Professor Scott, representing College of the Pacific; Mr. Walt of Kansas State; Professor Marsh of U. C. S. B.; Professor Nichols of Redlands; and Professor Macarthur of Cal. Tech.

Extempore Contest:

Kansas State — Robert Hedberg, winner of first place
Redlands — Russell Andrus, winner of second place
Occidental — Mildred Zellhopfer, winner of third place
College of the Pacific — Edgar Wilson
California Tech. — Ted Coleman
U. of C., S. B. — Henry Murphy

The subjects selected for the extempore ranged from "Promoting interest in forensics" and "Coeducation" to the "Fall of the Herriot Government" and "Politicians, the enemies of Statesmanship," which was used by Mr. Hedberg, the winner.

The Coach Judge system was used: Mrs. Peters, Occidental; Professor Scott, representing College of the Pacific; Mr. Walt of Kansas State; Professor Marsh of U. C. S. B.; Professor Nichols of Redlands; and Professor Pergelis of Cal. Tech.

In the final debate William Berger and Helen Jackson represented U. of C. S. B. upheld the affirmative. Robert Ross and Robert Fulwider of Cal. Tech.

upheld the negative. The judges were Messrs. Summers and Walt of Kansas Aggies and Scott of Pomona. The Decision was 2 to 1 for the affirmative. Dinner was held at six forty-five after which the business session was held. Professor Scott of Pomona College, a member at large, was elected Governor of the Province. The chief order of business was the National Convention at Estes Park and the chapters responded as follows: Cal. Tech. has over one hundred dollars in the fund for attending the convention and expects to send as many representatives as it can get money for. Occidental has raised no funds but intends to be there and hopes to have a debating team. U. of C. S. B. is planning on two debating teams and hopes to send from six to eight delegates. Redlands said that it had never missed having a debating team at a convention yet and was not going to break the precedent next year. College of the Pacific said that it had never attended a convention before but had enjoyed the provincial so much that it would be at Estes Park. Kansas Aggies said they had never missed a convention and expected to be at Estes Park in full force. Professor Scott said that he was going to try to save enough from his salary as Provincial Governor to enable him to attend.

WESTERN PROVINCE

The Western Province of ΠΚΔ, with Missouri Zeta, Culver-Stockton, as host, assembled at Canton, April 23-25. President Reeves of Westminster presided. The convention assembled at two o'clock, with the following chapters represented: Culver-Stockton, Carthage, Missouri Wesleyan, Central (Missouri), Central (Iowa), Westminster, William Jewell, Upper Iowa, Simpson, and Henderson-Brown, all the members of the province except Park and Central Missouri State Teachers.

The first thing on the program was the debating tournament, the results of which can best be shown by the table below:

Missouri Wesleyan,
affirmative

versus

Simpson
negative
William Jewell,
affirmative

versus

Carthage,
negative

Culver-Stockton,
affirmative

versus

Central (Missouri)
negative
Central (Iowa),
affirmative

versus

Upper Iowa,
negative

Missouri Wesleyan,
affirmative

versus

William Jewell,
negative

William Jewell,
affirmative

Central
(Missouri)

Central (Missouri),
negative

Central (Missouri),
negative

versus

Central (Iowa),
affirmative

There were but two entries in the women's extempore. The results were as follows:

First—Edith Friedon, Upper Iowa. Subject: Should the United States cancel her inter-allied war debts?

Second—Frances Neilsen, Carthage. Subject: Should the Philippines be granted immediate independence?

There were more speakers in the men's extempore. The results were:

First—Roberts of William Jewell. Subject: Can legislation help the farmer?

Second—Tenschler of Westminster. Does the United States need a protective tariff?

Third—Crawford, Missouri Wesleyan. Should the government own the coal mines?

Fourth—Brooks, Carthage. Should tax exempt securities be done away with?

Fifth—Tie between Heddington and Tate both of Upper Iowa. Subjects:

(a) To what extent should education be made compulsory?

(b) The railroads and the motor bus.

Sixth—Cunningham, Culver-Stockton. Cooperative marketing and the farmer.

Seventh—Mudd, Culver-Stockton. The League of Nations as an instrument for world peace.

This contest was followed by the women's oratorical which resulted as follows:

First—Doris Hatch, Simpson. The Call to Service.

Second—Nadine Nichols, Missouri Wesleyan. The Dragnet.

Third—Maurine Miller, Culver-Stockton. The King of the Electron.

Six orators competed in the men's oratorical.

First—A. P. Stone, William Jewell. The Challenge of Youth.

Second—Lloyd Sutton, Simpson. The Pathway to Peace.

Third—Boswell Burns, Culver-Stockton. The Modern Martyr.

Fourth—Clay Davis, Westminster. The Boy Under the Tree.

Fifth—Robert Smith, Upper Iowa. The Ploughshare of Revolution.

Sixth—Osro Cobb, Henderson-Brown. Let America Find Her Soul.

Some of the best oratory of the convention was produced at the banquet Friday evening, May 23. Here under the exhilarating influence of water, women, and song, the following program was "rendered."

Toastmaster Dr. Schultz, Culver-Stockton

Progress of Forensics.....President Wood, Culver-Stockton

In the Mountains....G. W. Finley, National Secretary, Colorado Teachers

Some Standards for Judging Contests.....

.....W. C. Dennis, National Vice-President, Simpson

Pi Kappa Delta and Public Speaking....Professor Reeves, Westminster

When Good Fellows Get Together...Professor Graham, Culver-Stockton

Osro Cobb issued such an enthusiastic invitation from the whole state of Arkansas, that it was voted to hold the next convention at Henderson-Brown.

The following officers were elected for the coming term:

President, Professor Graham, Culver-Stockton.

Vice-President, Debate coach at Henderson-Brown.

Secretary-Treasurer, Crawford, Missouri Wesleyan.

National Secretary-Treasurer G. W. Finley of Colorado Teachers was present representing the national council. He acted as debate judge several times and filled in otherwise wherever he was needed. His willingness to assist, and his broad minded view of things and analytical and constructive criticism of the contests were much appreciated. In behalf of the national council he issued a general invitation to all the chapters present to have a full delegation in Colorado next year. Each chapter left the convention resolved to let the whole society hear from it at the national convention in March.

KANSAS PROVINCIAL CONVENTION

A sectional Pi Kappa Delta tournament was held at Emporia the 4th and 5th of May, in which eight colleges participated. Competition in all forensic events was offered. In debate, the Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia, women's team was successful, the College of Emporia's men team winning in the men's debate. The Kansas State Agricultural College took first place in both men's and women's extemporaneous contests. Sterling college won the women's oratorical contest. The Kansas State Teachers College woman orator, who won the women's State Oratorical contest, did not compete in this event. The College of Emporia won the men's oratorical contest.

The last evening of the convention, a joint initiation into Pi Kappa Delta was held. The floor work was in charge of the college of Emporia, and the Kansas State Teachers College. Fifty individuals were initiated.

Note: The Kansas Provincial was organized late and on short notice. This is the best report the editor could get on it.

KANSAS THETA

The following is a resume of the forensic season of the Kansas State Teachers College of Emporia, Kansas, Theta. Fourteen men's debates, competing with such schools at Iowa State College, Utah Agricultural College, Drake University, Bethany College, Pittsburg Teachers College, Washburn College, College of Emporia, Friends University, and the Kansas City Law School.

Nine women's debates, competing with the following schools: Colorado Agricultural College, Hays Kansas Teachers College, Ottawa University, Washburn College, Kansas Agricultural College, Bethany College, Southwestern College, and the College of Emporia.

Two extemporaneous speaking teams, one men's and one women's, one woman orator.

Kansas Zeta chapter of Pi Kappa Delta, has this year taken in twenty-three new members; these with the original eight members, make at present an active membership of thirty-nine. There are nine members on the faculty.

The large number of new members taken in shows that the forensic work was widely distributed, giving practical training to a large number, rather than using the same individuals over and over in the different contests. The year has been a successful one, and we trust that the future may see forensics continue to grow.—Contributed.

NORTHERN ORATORICAL LEAGUE.

The finals in the Northern Oratorical League were held at Northwestern May 1. The results follow:

First, "The Challenge," Miss Frances Killefer, University of Illinois.

Second, "Natural and Human," Walter Lundgren, University of Minnesota.

Third, "The Twentieth Century Slave," Phillip N. Krasne, University of Michigan.

Also speaking:

"Shackles of Freedom," Howard Becker, Northwestern University.

"The Other half of Leadership," Miss Carol Hubbard, University of Wisconsin.

"The Permanent Court of International Justice," Arnold A. Lassen, The University of Iowa.

SHALL WE ADMIT NEW ARGUMENT IN REFUTATION?**A DEBATE ON A MUCH DISPUTED POINT***The Affirmative*

The Editor of the Forensic:

I wish to congratulate ΗΚΔ on the splendid work it has done in formulating the "Code of Ethics for Debate" published in the January Forensic. It was a fine piece of work. The code is comprehensive and moderate.

Will you permit me thru your columns to question the wisdom of including one article, number 20. "The introduction of new argument in rebuttal is contrary to the rules of debate. It should be so considered by the judges without the necessity of interruptions by opposing speakers."

This has long been one of the traditions of debating. Sixteen years ago when I took part in my first college debate it was an unwritten law, for we had no code of ethics then. One of the most painful situations of my forensic experiences came in connection with it. Our coach had drilled into us the idea that refutation should be something more than a repetition of what we had said in our first speeches. I was second speaker on a team which was having a hard fight with a neighboring institution. When I was about half-way thru my refutation, I was brutally interrupted by a loud voice from the opposing table. "Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order," I heard, "My opponent is introducing new argument." I shall never forget my sensations. I was presenting new evidence. While I had never thought of it as a violation of ethics, as soon as my opponent spoke, I realized my guilt. If any criminal caught red handed in the very act ever felt more aghast, I pity him. Here I was exposed in dishonorable conduct on the platform of my own chapel and before my own friends. I can remember yet how the row of electric lights around the gallery blurred and danced.

I don't know how I ever got to my seat. I had no idea of fighting back. I was convicted in my own mind although I had had no intention of doing anything wrong. I was completely floored and helpless. The leader of our team replied to the charge. I don't remember anything about his defense. My accuser was not to be lightly turned aside however. He insisted that the debate should be forfeited. Finally he said something about cancelling further contracts. The word contract set my mind to going again. I had acted as debate manager and had signed the contract between the two institutions. I knew that there wasn't one word in that contract about the introduction of new argument in refutation. I struggled to my feet and pulled our copy of the contract from my breast pocket. "Here is the contract," I gasped with a faint hope in my heart of redeeming my shattered reputation. "There is nothing in it forbidding the introduction of new argument."

Victory was not to be so easily won. I shall never forget the fine scorn with which my opponent replied. "Why that doesn't have to be in the contract. Everybody knows that." I sank back in my seat again, convicted by my own conscience.

An able chairman settled the point and saved the day. After fifteen minutes of quibbling, I was called back to the platform, informed that I had over two minutes left, and ordered to proceed. I still had that gone feeling in the pit of my stomach, but I shuffled my cards, finally caught a few words on one and started. I had not said two words before I realized that I was again introducing new evidence. I couldn't see anything to do but to give additional evidence or repeat. I don't

know what I did. If I did any debating it was purely automatic, for my mind was engrossed in my preplexing situation. After the debate the quibbling was renewed. Our opponents objected to any new statement. Coaches and friends joined in. It seemed impossible to draw any dividing line between new argument and new evidence.

Years later while I was acting as a judge a hot headed coach interrupted a debate to hurl the same charge. Again it was the same narrow interpretation of new argument. Again this past week the question arose during a debate which I was judging. If Congress can reenact legislation declared unconstitutional by the supreme court, it is correcting the faults of our constitution, argued the affirmative. In refutation the negative contended that if that was the case, we had a violation of state rights, for we should have Congress amending the constitution without giving the states an opportunity to vote on the amendment as was provided in the constitution. "You are introducing the question of state rights," interrupted the affirmative, "and that is new argument."

Where are you going to draw the line? It was new evidence and new argument, but it was called forth very naturally during the process of the debate. To deny the negative the right to present it would be unduly limiting it. This is almost always true. I listened to a negative introducing an alternative plan in a last refutation speech. It was new argument, but the speaker was careful to show that he was presenting it in reply to a statement by the affirmative that compulsory arbitration in labor disputes was the only way in which we could protect the interests of the public.

I question the whole proposition. When and where did it ever start, and why? Can it be enforced? Is it not more liable to lead to trouble than to good? I have never known the side which raised the question to win. Of course the idea is to prevent the introduction of some fallacious proposition at a time when the other side can not attack it, but isn't the cure worse than the disease? What would happen if the rule were dropped? The gateway is not let down to any evil practices, for even now the most foreign material may be introduced under the guise of refutation of some opposing statement. Any sensible debater who has a good argument to advance will want to inject it into the debate at the earliest possible moment. Any judge will be suspicious of argument that is introduced when the opposition has no opportunity to reply to it. Hard feelings and unprofitable quibbling would be eliminated.

I am not well enough versed in the history of intercollegiate forensics to know what authority stands back of this more or less universally accepted but poorly understood principle. I don't see how it can be fairly enforced. It is often abused. Wouldn't debaters and coaches alike do better to drop it? Perhaps there are good arguments for its retention which I do not now see. I shall look forward to seeing them presented by its friends.

In the interests of more harmony in debating,

I remain,
A FORMER DEBATER.

The Negative

(When the editor received the letter printed above, he sent it to F. B. Ross, Professor of Social Sciences, Kansas Zeta, Kansas State Teachers College, Emporia, with the request that he reply to it. The reply is printed below.)

On several occasions during the past debate season the negative has not been entirely satisfied with the tactics employed by the last affirmative rebuttal speaker and has not hesitated to interrupt to make

the fact known. These actions have caused considerable controversy in forensic circles and in it all, Article twenty of the "Code of Ethics for Debate," published in the January, 1925, Forensic, has been under fire. The first part of the controversy resolves itself into this question: What really is refutation? Is it a mere summing up of the debate? Is it a repetition of what has been said in the main speeches? Is it a battering down of the opponents arguments with evidence, whether or not it has been used earlier in the debate? Or, does it include the introduction of new argument as well as new evidence? Each of these positions is taken by men in the forensic field today.

I do not pretend to be an authority, but I wish to add a word in defense of the first part of Article twenty of the Code of Ethics mentioned above.—"The introduction of new argument in rebuttal is contrary to the rules of debate." Before going farther we must distinguish between "argument" and "evidence." Argument is a reason for or against a proposition, an advantage or disadvantage; while evidence is material offered in support of the above contentions. For example: In a recent debate on the Supreme Court question, a final affirmative rebuttal speaker cited ten Supreme Court decisions in an attempt to defeat three weaknesses in their proposition as pointed out by the negative. These decisions had not been mentioned prior to this time in the debate by either side, but my contention is that they constituted legitimate evidence at that particular juncture in the debate. The speaker committed a gross error, however, in his closing statement when he said, "Finally, ladies and gentlemen, the plan advocated by the affirmative will foster a more friendly feeling between the United States and England as the two systems of legislation will be similar." This is an argument, but neither side had hinted at it previously in the debate, consequently it was NEW and entirely out of place in the last rebuttal speech.

The second part of the controversy centers around this question: Should a speaker be interrupted? Here is where I differ with the second part of Article twenty.—"It should be so considered by the judges without the necessity of interruption by opposing speakers." My position is that the last affirmative rebuttal speaker should be interrupted in case he violates the first part of this rule. There is a question, however, as to whether or not there should be interruptions at other times as there is a chance for a comeback, but the negative is not through debating until the affirmative is through. To me it is a sign of splendid work to see the negative hold the affirmative in final rebuttal to the question and to the arguments already advanced. There is nothing that gives me a hollow feeling at the pit of my stomach quite so much as to listen to a negative team do splendid work until its last rebuttal speaker has finished, then slump down in its seats with a sigh as much as to say, "Thank God we are through," and thereafter pay no attention to their opponent who is closing the debate. One coach has stated that he has never seen a team win whose members had interrupted the opposition. Let me ask, Is the purpose of debate to win a decision or is it the honest, conscientious, fair presentation of facts? If we leave it to the judges to penalize the speaker who has violated this rule, we have made no headway, for we are still enthroning the idea of winning. Furthermore, the majority of the judges we get these days are not capable of distinguishing between "argument" and "evidence"; while others consider it a point in favor of the team that has resorted to a "trick" if they can "get away" with it without being challenged by the opposition. But the greatest reason for allowing the interruption is that otherwise the audience would be left out of consideration. Efficient as a

judge may be in detecting "tricks," the average audience is still in the dark as to the reasons for his decision, unless the critic system is used.

I would go farther and say it is the duty of the chairman to hold the affirmative to the question and already advanced argument in the final speech, in case the opposition does not do so; but at the same time it is also his duty to protect this speaker from unfair attacks by the opposition. The object of a debate should not be to please a judge, but to inspire the listeners by truth honestly presented. Hence it is my belief that it is not only a right but a duty of the negative to hold the affirmative strictly to the rule even though it must be done by interruption. To do so is a sign of good debating, while to fail in this point is a sign of poor work.

CLEVER INITIATION FOR PI KAPPA DELTA GIVEN

Last Friday some of the new pledged members of the ΠΚΔ were initiated into that organization. The initiation dealt out by the committee this year consisted of five minute chapel talks for some, and three minutes of street talks, in front of the post office, for others. The subjects for the talks were also given out to the new members of the committee.

Edith Frieden started the ball rolling by giving her talk in chapel last Friday. Miss Frieden's topic was Labor Problems, about which she gave a very interesting discussion.

In the afternoon of the same day, at four-thirty, six of the new members gave their "Soap Box Orations" in front of the postoffice. The speakers and their topic were as follows:

Mr. John Lyford—Robert LaFollette.

Mr. Kenneth Rawson—Senator Brookhart.

Miss Vera Decker—Pi Kappa Delta.

Miss Eleanor Parker—Bolshevism.

Miss Agnes Corbitt—Coolidge.

Mr. Veylerd Humeence—Woman's Rights.

There was considerable humor mixed in with the interesting facts that were given. A good-sized crowd was present which seemed to enjoy the program that was rendered.—Upper Iowa Collegian.

ALABAMA BOY, 15, WINS FIRST PLACE IN HIGH SCHOOL CONSTITUTION AND ORATORICAL CONTEST

Washington, May 8.—(By Associated Press.)—Robert Sessions of Birmingham, Ala., tonight won the national oratorical contest over six competitors chosen in regional contests from among 1,400,000 starters.

The finals, which were held in Washington's new auditorium with an opening address by President Coolidge, were judged by Chief Justice Taft, Justices Van Devanter, Butler and Sanford of the Supreme court, and Attorney General Sargent. All of the orations dealt with the federal constitution.

The winner was 15 years old and the youngest of the seven contestants. Eugene F. McElmeel of Los Angeles, aged 16, rated second; Max N. Kroloff of Sioux City, Iowa, third; Miss Flora Longenecker of Ilion, N. Y., fourth; Miss Asenath Graves of Washington, D. C., fifth; George Stansell of Chicago sixth, and Philip Glatfelter of Columbia, Penn., seventh. Both of the girls are 16 years old and all of the boys except Sessions and McElmeel, are 17.

The Washington Alpha women at Puget Sound won a popular decision from the Willamette ladies on the affirmative of the Japanese question. The men lost twice to Willamette and to Lawrence once on the Supreme Court question.—*The Trail*.

THE NATIONAL CATALOG OF DEBATE JUDGES IS MEETING WITH FAVOR

"The National Catalog of Debate Judges," edited by Professor H. B. Summers, Kansas State Agricultural College, and published by $\Pi K \Delta$ has evidently filled a long felt need. Scores of enthusiastic letters have been received from all parts of the country.

In publishing this catalog $\Pi K \Delta$ was frankly experimenting. It has asked for criticisms of its work. Almost all of those who have written about it, even some of the judges who received "M" and "X" ratings, have thanked the society for accomplishing a beneficial piece of work.

It was inevitable that some would not approve. The society expected this. It has been surprised that not more objections were received. What criticisms and objections have come in, have been helpful for the most part and will aid the society in its future work.

The one violent objection appeared in the April, 1925, number of "The Quarterly Journal of Speech Education," over the signature of F. M. Perry, Wellesley College.

He objects, first, to the fact that we do not give the names of those who give the "A", "X" and other ratings. This is undoubtedly one of the weaknesses of our rating system, but it is simply impossible to get signed ratings to be published. Mr. Perry himself, while he probably will give an estimate of the capabilities of a man as debate judge to some one asking him for it, would be unwilling to have this inquirer present that opinion to the proposed judge with his name back of it. It would probably do more harm than good to do it anyway. The opinions privately expressed are probably more honest. Teachers who recommend students for positions usually do so with the understanding that their recommendations are not to fall into the hands of the students.

It does not follow that because a man is a debate coach that he is also a good judge. Mr. Perry assumes that any one who is coaching debating must by that very fact be an excellent judge. It will not be hard to supply ample evidence to prove that this is an unwarranted assumption, even tho the debate coach himself may not relish the fact.

Perhaps also Mr. Perry does not understand that the people whose names appeared in the book did not have to have them appear. Each one was asked to supply certain information about himself and understood what this information was to be used for. If he requested that his name not appear in the list, his request was respected. Perhaps some of those who received an adverse rating regretted after the rating appeared that they had not withheld their names. Undoubtedly some feelings have been hurt. $\Pi K \Delta$ sincerely regrets this. However, it is perhaps best to discourage these unsatisfactory judges from continuing to serve. Their unsatisfactory decisions but stir up unpleasantness. The state finds it necessary to prohibit those unqualified from practicing medicine, no matter what their feelings.

The objection to the fact that the society disclaims responsibility for the ratings published is an objection to the only possible plan and to the common practice. Even the Quarterly Journal of Speech Education in publishing Mr. Perry's letter does not assume responsibility for his opinions. The ratings are only what they profess to be, the opinions of debate coaches who have had opportunity to see the work of these judges.

These objections from Mr. Perry seem to be well made. They will help $\Pi K \Delta$ to publish a more useful list another time. However there are other assertions in the article which probably do not help any one to arrive at the truth concerning the matter. "At any rate I should like to attribute to well meaning but thoughtless youth and inexperience such violation of

academic decorum as the National Catalog of Debate Judges recently issued by the Pi Kappa Delta Honorary Forensic Fraternity."

"But for an organization while disclaiming responsibility for its ratings, to publish and distribute them gratis through the country in the name of public service, suggests the boulder's obliviousness to the full effect of his cheerful impertinences."

Neither of these statements has any value in a sincere effort to arrive at the truth in a courteous discussion, but suggest more the individual who lacks the culture which enables him to differ from another without attempting to insult him. There is room for two opinions on most questions without those holding either forfeiting their right to be considered sincere gentlemen. While the society does not question Mr. Perry's right to object to its publication, it does not accept his authority for awarding it the social classification he does not hesitate to award. "The crass insensitiveness" which he freely bestows upon ΠΚΔ does not prove the catalog a fiasco.

Mr. Perry's objection to the use of the term "Professor," grows, undoubtedly, out of his failure to read correctly the statement in the catalog. Instead of trying to maintain the distinction between "Professor," "Associate Professor," and "Assistant Professor," ΠΚΔ used the more generic and inclusive term. Here it is following a widely accepted practice, both in and outside of educational circles. The title "Professor" was not inaccurately used nor improperly conferred upon those not entitled to it. Undoubtedly this objection on the part of Mr. Perry was due to a hasty assumption.

When the inventor Olds drove the first automobile upon the streets of Chicago, many people objected on the grounds that it would frighten the horses. They were right. But if progress in rapid transportation had been halted by this objection, Detroit would not now be the city it is. Mr. Perry tells us what kind of a list would meet with his approval, but that does not produce a list of judges. The "National Catalog" at least marks a beginning. It has frightened the horses. It is undoubtedly as far from satisfactory and from what will finally be achieved, as Mr. Olds first automobile is from a modern high priced car. However, if Mr. Olds had not driven that first noisy, smoking, rattling contraption, we should today be saying "Get up," and "Whoa," instead of "Step on the gas."

But what about the system Mr. Perry proposes? "Of even greater value to those who would rather know something about a judge before opening correspondence with him, would be a list of established and recognized professors in different sections willing to name men fitted to act as judges of debate on specific subjects." Such a system would do some of the very things Mr. Perry objects to. Here we should have men secretly passing judgment on proposed judges. Again there might be "slugging in the dark." Such a proposal does not convince us that we have yet found the Moses who will lead us out of our wilderness.

David Shepard, who became a member of the Colorado Alpha during his freshman year, is now president of the senior class at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology.—*The Rocky Mountain News*.

Paul Bemenderfer won the local Peace contest at Heidelberg with the oration "The Last Strand."—*The Kilikilik*.

DEBATE QUESTIONS SUGGESTED FOR 1926

The following questions were suggested for the 1926 official question in response to a questionnaire sent out by the national secretary.

1. That a federal child labor constitutional amendment should be ratified.
 1. Otterbein
 2. Transylvania
 3. Redlands
 4. Intermountain Union
 5. Sterling
 6. Franklin
 7. Washburn
 8. Augustana
2. That the United States should adopt a uniform marriage and divorce law.
 1. Tulsa
 2. Gustavus Adolphus
 3. Baker
 4. Washburn
 5. Augustana
3. That the Philippine Islands should be granted their immediate independence.
 1. Akron
 2. Lombard
 3. Central (Iowa)
 4. Illinois Wesleyan
 5. Centre
4. That there should be no discrimination against the Japanese in our immigration laws.
 1. Otterbein
 2. Intermountain Union
 3. McKendree
 4. Centre
5. That there should be a federal department of education with a secretary in the president's cabinet.
 1. Southwestern (Texas)
 2. Henderson-Brown
 3. Centre
 4. Iowa Wesleyan
6. That American foreign debts contracted between April, 1917 and November, 1918, for war purposes should be cancelled.
 1. Emporia
 2. Intermountain Union
 3. Linfield
7. That tax exempt securities should no longer be issued.
 1. Baker
 2. Colorado Agricultural College
 3. Henderson-Brown
8. That the United States should recognize the Soviet government.
 1. Akron
 2. Bethany
 3. Simpson
9. That the system of direct primaries should be abolished.
 1. Coe
 2. Colorado Teachers
 3. Gustavus Adolphus
10. That each state should adopt a system of compulsory voting.
 1. Tulsa
 2. Baker
11. That capital punishment should be abolished in all states.
 1. Simpson
 2. Washburn
12. That capital as well as men should be conscripted during war.
 1. Redlands
 2. Sioux Falls
13. That the people of the United States should have the power to declare war by a direct vote except in cases of insurrection or foreign invasion.
 1. Redlands
 2. Univ. of Calif., S. B.
14. That the Senate rules should be amended as suggested by Mr. Dawes.
 1. McKendree
 2. Fairmount
15. That the delegated powers should be the state powers and the residuary powers the federal powers.
 1. William Jewell
 2. Central (Iowa)
16. That Senate Rule 20 (?) should be repealed.
 1. Bradley
 2. Centre
17. That the United States should withdraw troops from Latin-American countries.

1. Kalamazoo
18. That the president should be elected by direct vote.
 1. Southwestern (Texas)
19. That the president and vice-president should be nominated by a direct preferential primary.
 1. Bethany
20. That each state should adopt the single tax as the basis of its taxing system.
 1. Emporia
21. That the federal government should discontinue the policy of leasing to private individuals and corporations the natural resources over which it has control.
 1. North Carolina State
22. That a national referendum should be taken on all decisions of the Supreme court which declare acts of Congress unconstitutional.
 1. Intermountain Union
23. That the United States should adopt the cabinet-parliamentary form of government.
 1. Northern Normal and Industrial School.
24. That the Volstead act should be amended so as to permit the manufacture and sale of light wines and beer.
 1. Coe
25. That the 18th amendment should be repealed.
 1. Coe.
26. That the United States should join the World Court.
 1. Howard Payne
27. That higher education should be subsidized by the federal government.
 1. Bethany
28. That the restrictions of the tariff preferential regulation should be delegated to the Tariff Commission.
 1. Akron
29. That the United States coastwise vessels should be exempted from Panama Canal tolls.
 1. Linfield.
30. That the pardoning power should be taken from the governor's hands and given to a board of 12 men.
 1. Kentucky Wesleyan.
32. That women should receive the same wages as men for the same work.
 1. Fairmount
33. That the Towner-Reed bill should be passed by Congress.
 1. Montana State
34. That Congress should be given power to pass uniform social legislation in the United States.
 1. Montana State
35. That the United States should adopt the essentials of the Canadian system for immigration control.
 1. Montana State
36. That Congress should be empowered to enact a national uniform criminal court procedure act.
 1. Illinois Wesleyan
37. That the principle of the closed shop is justifiable.
 1. Upper Iowa
38. That the United States should own and operate the coal mines.
 1. Upper Iowa
39. That the United States should own and operate the railroads.
 1. Upper Iowa

THE FORENSIC OF OUR COLLEGE PRESIDENTS

Π K Δ is proud to present in this issue the pictures of 14 of the presidents of the colleges in which we have chapters who are members of the society.

Five of them have been elected to honorary membership because of their interest in forensics. The other nine in addition to their interest had a right to join upon their own forensic record. Three of them, Presidents John L. Hillman of Simpson, George S. McCune of Huron, and B. H. Kroeze of Jamestown, were college orators. Four were debaters, Presidents George W. Frasier of Colorado Teachers College, Frank E. Mossman of Morningside, H. W. Foght of Northern Normal and Industrial School, and George S. McCune of Huron. Four have coached debating and oratory, Presidents A. Ames Montgomery of Centre, Ross Turner Campbell of Sterling, Howard McDonald of Parsons, and George S. McCune of Huron.

The five honorary members are Presidents E. D. Kohlstedt of Dakota Wesleyan, Edward H. Todd of the College of Puget Sound, Bradford Knapp of Oklahoma Agricultural and Mechanical College, O. J. Johnson of Gustavus Adolphus, and Leonard W. Riley of Linfield.

There are many interesting things connected with the forensic experiences of these men. President Mossman of Morningside was a member of the first debating team ever put out by Morningside. Former Governor Harding of Iowa was a member of the same team.

In 1886 President John L. Hillman of Simpson represented Ohio Wesleyan in the state contest. The subject of his oration was "Dangerous Tendencies in Modern Commercial Life." One of the judges was William Howard Taft. The contest was won by Dr. Howard H. Russell, the organizer of the Anti-Saloon League, who represented Ohio in the interstate contest at Leavenworth, Kansas. Oratory certainly brings one in contact with people of distinction. What a rich heritage of pleasant memories must be President Hillman's from the acquaintances his efforts in oratory brought him. Some day the Forensic hopes to be able to persuade him to write the interesting story of these experiences. Who knows where our orators of today will be 20, 30, or 40 years from now?

President Harold W. Foght represented the University of Nebraska in debating in 1893 and 1894 against Doane College and the University of Kansas. We wonder what he debated so many years ago.

President George S. McCune was both a debater and an orator. He won his debates in 1899 and 1900 when he represented Park against William Jewell and Missouri Valley. He ranked second among the 8 speakers in the Missouri state contest.

President Kroeze of Jamestown represented the University of Michigan in oratory in 1894.

One of the youngest college presidents of the country is President George W. Frasier of Colorado Teachers College who represented Michigan State Normal College against Michigan Aggies in 1911 and against Ferris Institute in 1916.

Those chapters who can list their college presidents among their members are fortunate. If the president debated during his college days, he will understand the problems of financial support. He will have an understanding and sympathy which will mean much to the struggling debaters and orators. Whether or not he participated in forensics during his college days, he now is charged with directing the many activities of the college and moulding them all into one unified program. If he understands what efforts the debaters are making and, even more important, if the Π K Δ people understand where he is directing the course of the college, better cooperation will result. If he is interested in forensics, the president of the college makes a valuable member of the chapter.